## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Intro	oduction
Π.	Disc	eussion
	A.	This Court, if it Opts to Decline Jurisdiction, Should Only Decline Jurisdiction Over The Unruh Act Claim
	B.	This Court Does Not Face a "Hobson's Choice" as McIver
		Has Pled Intent in His Complaint and Has a Right to Prove
		Up Such Intent4-5
	C.	Gunther Misinterpreted the Current Law, as Well as the
		Statutes at Issue and This Court is Not Bound by a State
		Appellate Court Decision
		1. Gunther Is Not Controlling and it Directly
		Contradicts Prior Ninth Circuit Law5-6
		2. Legislative History6-10
		i. Plain Language
		3. Simply Put, the State Claims Do NOT Present Novel
		or Complex Issues of Law10-11
	D.	Even Without a Statutory Analysis, Gunther is WRONG
		on the Law
III.	Con	clusion

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## Cases

Burks v. Poppy Construction Co.,
57 Cal.2d 463 (1962)
Digenova v. State Bd. Of Educ.,
57 Cal.2d 167, 178 (1962) 5 n.1
Gunther v. Lin,
50 Cal.Rptr.3d 317 (Cal.App. 2006)
Harris v. Capital Growth Investors XIV,
52 Cal.3d 1142 (1991)
In re Watts,
298 F.3d. 1077 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002)
Isbister v. Boys' Club of Santa Cruz,
40 Cal.3d 72 (1985)
Johnson v. Barlow,
2007 WL 1723617 (E.D. Cal)
Kimmel v. Goland,
51 Cal.3d 202 (1990)
Koire v. Metro Car Wash,
40 Cal.3d 24 (1985)
Lentini v. California Center for the Arts, Escondido,
370 F.3d 837 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004)2-5, 10
Modern Development Co. v. Navigators, Ins. Co.,
4 Cal.Rptr.3d 528 (2003)

2007 WL 1989635 (S.D. Cal.)	10
Takahashi v. Loomis Armored Car Serv., 625 F.2d 314 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980)	5
Wells v. One2One Learning Found., 29 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1164 (2006)	9
Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control Dist., 49 Cal.3d 408 (1989)	
Wilson v. Haria and Gogri Corp. dba Jack-In-The-Box #551, et al., 479 F.Supp.2d 1127 (E.D. Cal. 2007)	4-10
Statutas	
<u>Statutes</u>	
Cal. Civ. Code § 51	. 6-8
Cal. Civ. Code § 51(f)	3, 15
Cal. Civ. Code § 52.	. 6-9
28 U.S.C. § 1367	9-10
42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv)	13